

Remarks

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 are pending. Claim 4 is canceled in this Response.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Suzuki 4882621 in view of Paulson 20020069956. Claims 11-14 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Suzuki in view Paulson and Oshikoshi 4769694. Claims 15-19 stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Suzuki, Paulson, Oshikoshi and well known prior art. The rejections are all based on the assertion that it would be obvious to combine the conventional lamination of Paulson with Suzuki "in order to protect the image surface with a transparent layer." This assertion is not correct.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 4. Amended Claim 1 recites that each printed portion of the transparent media is laminated to a plastic card with the side of the transparent media containing the images being adhered to the card. A similar amendment has been made to method Claim 11.

So far as is relevant to the claimed subject matter, Paulson stands for the unremarkable proposition that it was known in the art to laminate a clear layer of material on to the top/front of a printed ID card. Paulson is silent as to the position of images printed on the ID card. Presumably, therefore, the images on the ID card in Paulson are printed in a conventional fashion in a normal orientation (not reversed) on the front of the card. That is to say, the reader of the laminated ID in Paulson looks through the clear layer of laminating material to view the images on the ID card.

In Suzuki, the printed image on "ink holding layer 21" is already protected on both sides by "transparent layer 20" and "ink transfer layer 22." Suzuki Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 9-23. The image surface in Suzuki is already protected and there is no need to laminate on another layer. Indeed, Suzuki actually teaches away from any type of lamination – it is a principle object of Suzuki to eliminate the need for laminating the printed media. Suzuki column 1, lines 23-30 and lines 43-49. Hence, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine conventional ID card lamination as in Paulson with the tri-layer printing medium of Suzuki.

Serial No.: 09/702,380
Attorney Docket No.: 10992667-1

If the Examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Paulson and Suzuki that might fairly be read to suggest the tri-layer printing medium of Suzuki should be laminated as claimed. Absent such a showing, the rejections should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
Attorney for Applicants